Remarks

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of U.S. Publication 2003/0128891 of *Hoover et al.* ("Hoover").

Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of *Hoover* and U.S. Patent No. 7,064,783 of *Colavin et al.* ("Colavin").

Claims 2-7, 11-12, and 14-24 are allowed.

Claim 2 is amended to remove unnecessary words.

New claims 25-27 are added.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 8 is not obvious in view of *Hoover* because *Hoover* does not teach or suggest using an image sensor to capture a series of image strips while a camera containing the image sensor is panned as claimed in amended claim 8. Instead, *Hoover* teaches capturing images of a bullet, the sample 30, while the bullet is rotated by a stepper motor 18. (*Hoover*, paragraphs 39-40). The camera 26 of *Hoover* does not pan but is instead attached to a microscope 12. (*Hoover*, Figure 1).

Furthermore, Hoover does not teach capturing a series of image strips each encompassing a sub area of an image sensor used to sample a panoramic image as claimed in amended claim 8. Instead, the camera 26 of Hoover captures full frames which are then transferred to a computer 28 that slices the full frames and uses the slices to form panoramic image strips 34 and 36. (Hoover, paragraph 39). The examiner has stated that the panoramic image strips 34 and 36 of Hoover each encompass a sub area of an image sensor. (Page 2, Office Action, 6-2-08). It is respectfully submitted that Hoover clearly teaches that the image strips 34 and 36 are generated by step rotating a bullet seventy-two times and imaging the bullet each of the seventy-two times and then combining the seventy-two samples into the image strips 34 and 36 using the computer 28. (Hoover, paragraph 39). Therefore, the image strips 34 and 36 of Hoover encompass a series of seventy-two images rather than sub areas of an image sensor as claimed in amended claim 8.

Applicant also submits that claims 9-10 are not obvious in

view of Hoover and Colavin because Hoover and Colavin do not disclose or suggest the limitations of amended claim 8 from which claims 9-10 depend. Applicant has shown that Hoover does not disclose or suggest the limitations of amended claim 8. Colavin does not disclose or suggest capturing a series of image strips each encompassing a sub area of an image sensor used to sample a panoramic image as claimed in amended claim 8. Instead, Colavin teaches capturing and stitching full frames. (Colavin, frames A-D in Figure 3 and stitching in Figure 4). The examiner has stated that Figures 3, 6, and 9 of Colavin show strips of a panoramic image. (Page 3, Office Action, 6-2-08). It is respectfully submitted that Colavin does not teach or suggest that the frames A-D in Figure 3 or the pictures N in Figure 9 encompass sub areas of an image sensor as claimed in amended claim 8. It is further submitted that the preview areas 602 and 702 and 802 shown in Figures 6-8 of Colavin are graphical illustrations of the stitching process of Figure 4 of Colavin (Colavin, col. 7, lines 50-52) rather than capture image strips each encompassing a sub area of an image sensor as claimed in amended claim 8.

It is further submitted that new claims 25-27 are not obvious in view of *Hoover* and *Colavin*. New claims 25-25 recite a camera that includes limitations similar to the limitations of amended claim 8. Therefore, the remarks stated above with respect to amended claim 8 and *Hoover* and *Colavin* also apply to new claims 25-27.

It is submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7-8-08 By:_

Paul H. Horstmann Reg. No.: 36,167